

Appl. No. 10/691,744
Amdt. dated April 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 5, 2005

REMARKS

I. CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1, 5-10, and 14-24 were pending. Claims 19-24 have been canceled. Claims 6 and 15 have been amended. Claims 25-28 have been added. Claims 1, 5-10, 14-18, and 25-28 are therefore pending.

Claims 6 and 15 have been amended to remove an unnecessary term.

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

The examiner objected to claim 6 as lacking an antecedent basis for "said inter processor port connection". Applicants have accordingly amended the claim to remove the term "inter processor".

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 5-10, and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,501 ("Horst"). Applicants respectfully traverse because the cited art fails to teach or suggest every element of the claims.

For example, independent claim 1 recites in part a "processor having at least one timer that expires when a message is not sent from the processor in a predetermined amount of time". Independent claim 10 recites a similar limitation. To anticipate these limitations, the examiner cites Horst at col. 29, lines 10-14, where Horst describes the operation of a request timer. However, Horst's request timer is not dependent on the failure to send the message, as is required by the claim. See, e.g., col. 21, lines 4-22; and col. 28, line 62 – col. 29, line 9. For at least this reason, independent claims 1 and 10, along with their dependent claims 5-9 and 14-18, respectively, are allowable over the cited art.

Independent claim 1 further recites "a separate timer associated with each of said message types to expire when a message of the associated message type is not sent in a predetermined amount of time". Independent claim 10 recites a similar limitation. To anticipate these limitations, the examiner cites Horst at col. 29, lines 10-16, where Horst describes the possibility of having a request timer for each of multiple outstanding requests. A request is but a single message type, so the cited portion of Horst fails to teach or suggest a separate timer for each of

Appl. No. 10/691,744
Amdt. dated April 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 5, 2005

multiple message types. Nor can applicants find such a teaching or suggestion elsewhere in Horst. For at least this additional reason, independent claims 1 and 10, along with their dependent claims 5-9 and 14-18, respectively, are allowable over the cited art.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

Claims 19-24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horst in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,924,119 ("Sindhu"). These claims have been canceled.

V. NEWLY ADDED CLAIMS

Newly added claims 25-28 are allowable over the cited art. Independent claim 25 recites individual timers for messages of different types, wherein the timers are reset when messages of the corresponding type are sent. These limitations are not found in the cited art because Horst teaches that timers are reset only upon receiving a response to a request. A request is a single type of message, so Horst's teachings of multiple timers fails to suggest having a timer for each of different message types. For at least this reason, independent claim 25 and its dependent claims 26-28 are allowable over the cited art.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are

Appl. No. 10/691,744
Amdt. dated April 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 5, 2005

hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Krueger
PTO Reg. No. 42,771
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400